

the Advisory Action mailed July 3, 2000. No agreement was reached pending the Examiner's further review when a response is filed. Arguments presented during the interview are reiterated below.

The present application includes 15 independent apparatus Claims 1, 13, 20, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34-38, 79-80 and 84 (as well as fifteen corresponding method claims 40, 52, 59, 67-69, 71, 73-77, 85-86 and 90), each of these independent claims has been amended to more clearly recite the features of the present invention as discussed during the interview. In particular, Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the commanding unit configured to command the transmitting node to transmit the information data through the channel, by using a protocol depending the second physical network, so as to perform data transfer to the receiving node even when the transmitting node connected to the second physical network only supports a protocol depending on the second network regardless of the inner connected network environment up to the receiving node.

For example, as shown in Figure 1, commands the transmitting terminal 1 to transmit the information data through the channel established by the establishing unit using a protocol depending on the second physical network so as to perform data transfer to the receiving node even when the transmitting node connected to the second physical network only supports a protocol depending on the second network regardless of the inner connected network environment up to the receiving node.

This differs from Keshav et al because Keshav et al teach a computer 100 which acts as a gateway between the Internet and ATM networks. That is, the devices on the Internet communicate with the computer 100 via the Internet protocol and then the computer 100 translates this information to an ATM network 300. The devices on the Internet work 310 do

Best Available Copy

not communicate with the devices on the ATM network via the Internet protocol.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted Claim 1 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably defines over Keshav et al.

Similar arguments apply to the rest of the independent claims which have been amended in a similar fashion as that to Claim 1.

Accordingly, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, it is respectfully submitted the pending claims are allowable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599  
David A. Bilodeau  
Registration No. 42,325



**22850**

(703) 413-3000  
Fax #: (703) 413-2220  
DAB/des

I:\atty\DAB\0039\00396551.prel.amd.wpd